

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner noted that Claims 1 through 12 were pending in the Application. Claims 1, 2, 7, 8, 11, and 12 have been amended. Claims 1-12 remain pending in this Application. Applicants traverse the rejections below.

I. Traversal of the Objection to the Drawings

The Drawings were objected to under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) and 1.83(a).

The objection under Section 1.84(p)(5) objects to the drawings because three elements mentioned in the description are purported not to be found in the drawings. "Method 3" is actually original-class class-initialization method 3 or short class initializer method 3", and element 3 is found in Figure 2. Similarly, "method 13" is helper-class instance initialization method 13, which is also found in Figure 2. Finally, "method 14" is class-initialization method 14, and is also found in Figure 2.

The objection under Section 1.83(a) indicates that the drawings fail to show certain elements. Modified interface 511 is in fact found in Figure 6 within the appropriate context of the description. Access function 24 is discussed in a number of places in the specification and is found in Figures 2, 3 and 4. One instance of access function 24 is illustrated in Figure 3 with data specified (Object o). Access function 24 is also shown in Figure 2, but without the form of the access function described in any detail at all. The corresponding access function is also shown without data specified in Table 1. Applicants submit that structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the invention is indeed shown in the drawings. In the case identified and objected to in the Office Action, more detail is actually shown. The access function is the same; the drawings and Table 1 show information in great detail. The purpose of

the drawings requirements is not to limit the information shown in the drawings, but to make sure that the description of the invention is enabling. The access function is the same throughout. Applicants suggest that a minor amendment to the Specification might be in order if there is some confusion, but submit that the drawings are sound, and respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

The Examiner's attention to detail in identifying these issues is appreciated.

II. Traversal of the Objection to the Specification

The issue identified in the Objection to the Specification has been corrected in this amendment. Accordingly, this objection should now be moot.

III Traversal of the Objection to the Claims

Claims 2, 11 and 12 were objected to for certain identified informalities. These informalities have been corrected in this amendment. Accordingly, this objection should now be moot.

IV Traversal of the Rejections under 35 U.S.C. Section 112

Claims 2, 3, 8 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 2, 8 and 11 have been amended to address the issues identified in this rejection. Applicants submit that these claims are now in conformance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. Section 112. Claim 3 was rejected for relying on Claim 2; since Claim 2 is now in conformance, Claim 3 should also now be in conformance.

V. Traversal of the Rejections over the Cited Art

Serial No. 09/838,478

8

Docket CH920000020US1

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,260,187 to Cirne. Applicants traverse this rejection below.

A. The Present Invention

The present invention discloses a technique of transforming a class is disclosed. The class is split and converted into a modified class and/or a helper class. After the transformation, a safe class sharing among several processes is achieved whereby the startup times and the memory usage for the processes are reduced. The inter-process communication (IPC) becomes faster. The proposed mechanism is particularly suited and efficient in an object-oriented environment, such as Java.

B. Differences between the Claims and the Cited Art

Cirne discloses a system for modifying object oriented code. The system receives three sets of inputs to be merged with the program class definitions. Three types of rules are employed. Each of the original class definitions are read into a class data structure and modifications are performed to the class data structure in accordance to the set of rules. The resulting class data is written to an output stream.

As discussed below, this appears to be fundamentally different from the present invention as recited in the present claims.

Independent Claim 1 recites "converting at least one said class field to an instance field and introducing the instance field into said helper class". Relative to this subject matter, the Office Action cited Column 4, lines 34-42 and Column 5, lines 4-7. Neither passage discusses converting a class field into an instance field. The latter passage discusses changing a static

field by creating a static field change rule. These are not the same thing.

Independent Claim 1 further recites "converting the original-class class-initialization method to a helper-class instance-initialization method". Relative to this subject matter, the Office Action cites Column 3, line 65 thru Column 4, line 3 of Cirne. This passage describes a substitute class rule to change the code that allocates an object of a first class to code that allocates the object to a new class. The cited Cirne package does not teach, suggest or disclose converting a method.

Independent Claim 1 further recites "introducing it into said helper class which comprises a helper-class class-initialization method". A passage from Column 4, lines 10-14 is cited. This passage does not teach, suggest or disclose anything about helper classes, much less introducing a helper-class instance-initialization method to a helper class.

Other similar differences exist between the remaining subject matter of Claim 1 and the cited passages of Cirne. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Cirne. It follows that dependent Claims 2-10 also patentably distinguish over Cirne.

Independent Claims 11 and 12 are similar in some respects to Claim 1. Specifically, the first and second subprocesses of Claim 11 were rejected for the same reasons as the passages of Claim 1 discussed above, and recite similar subject matter. Much of the clause beginning with "wherein" of Claim 12 were also rejected over the same passages, and recite similar subject matter. As it has been shown above that the cited passages from Cirne do not teach, suggest or disclose this subject matter, it follows that Independent Claims 11 and 12 also patentably distinguish over Cirne.

VI. Summary

Applicants have presented technical explanations and arguments fully supporting their position that the pending claims contain subject matter which is not taught, suggested or disclosed by Johnson, Gardner or any combination thereof. Accordingly, Applicants submit that the present Application is in a condition for Allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and a Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Gerald R. Woods
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 24,144

Docket No: CH9-2000-0020
PHONE: 919-254-1288
FAX: 919-254-4330